

Discussion

Large Sample Estimators of the Stochastic Discount Factor

by Soohun Kim and Robert A. Korajczyk

Christian Brownlees



Universitat Pompeu Fabra & Barcelona GSE

- This paper builds up on a recent working paper by Pukthuanthong and Roll (2016) (PR2016)
- Let $R_{i,t}^g$ denote the gross return on an asset i . As it is well known, standard asset pricing theory implies that there exist a stochastic discount factor m_t such that

$$E(m_t R_{i,t}^g) = 1$$

- PR2016 note that this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T m_t R_{i,t}^g &= E(m_t R_{i,t}^g) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (m_t R_{i,t}^g - E(m_t R_{i,t}^g)) \\ &\rightarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

- This relation motivates PR2016 to introduce a new estimator of the series of the SDF m_t $t = 1, \dots, T$
- Let $\mathbf{R}^g$ be the $N \times T$ matrix of gross asset returns and $\mathbf{m}$ the $T \times 1$ vector of observations of the SDF, then we have that

$$\frac{1}{T} \mathbf{R}^g \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{1}_N + \epsilon \approx \mathbf{1}_N$$

- This implies that we can recover approximately the vector $\mathbf{m}$ by minimizing the pricing errors using

$$\mathbf{m}^{pr} = T(\mathbf{R}^{gT} \mathbf{R}^g)^{-1} \mathbf{R}^{gT} \mathbf{1}_N$$

- PR approach
 - **Pros:** Approach is nonparametric as it imposes little structure on the problem
 - **Cons:** PR estimator may suffer from excessive variability
- This paper
 - provides estimators of the SDF m that aim at improving the estimation efficiency by assuming returns are generated by a factor model and using principal components

- Let returns be generated by a factor model

$$\mathbf{R}^g = \mathbf{B}^g \mathbf{F}^g + \mathbf{E}^g$$

- Let $\mathbf{P}_k^g$ denote the matrix of the first k eigenvectors of the $\mathbf{R}^g \mathbf{R}^g / T$ matrix
- The Kim and Korajczyk (2017) estimator is

$$\mathbf{m}_K^{kk} = \mathbf{P}_k^g ((\mathbf{R}^g \mathbf{P}_k^g / T)^T (\mathbf{R}^g \mathbf{P}_k^g / T))^{-1} (\mathbf{R}^g \mathbf{P}_k^g / T) \mathbf{1}_N$$

Additional Results

- Paper analyses properties of this class of estimators and introduces different versions of the factor-based SDF estimator
- Carrys out at a realistic and extensive simulation study to assess the value added of the proposed methodology

Comment #1

- In a way, it is clear that the basic PR2016 can suffer from excessive variability and principal components is a natural approach to impose some regularization
- It maybe interesting to relate the proposed estimator to other shrinkage/regularization procedures in the literature
- In particular, a simple ridge type version of the PR estimator could be a more interesting benchmark

Comment #2

- It is not surprising to see that the proposed estimator performs better than the PR2016 benchmark in the simulation study
- It could be argued that the DGP used in the exercise (a strict k -factor model) is clearly realistic but is bound to produce results where the proposed estimator wins by a large margin
- Would it be possible to employ a DGP in which it is less clear that the proposed technology delivers large gains?

Comment #3

- Ultimately, it would be interesting to apply the proposed estimator to real data
- Do the authors have a strategy to assess the gains of more precise SDF estimation on real data?

Conclusions

Conclusion

- Interesting paper which I recommend reading
- Natural development of the PR2016 approach